63. THE BOLOGNA PROCESS

Received:

(a) An oral report from Dr E Ritchie, Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Teaching & Learning) on issues relating to Europe which were currently having an impact on higher education.

(b) A paper in support of Dr Ritchie’s oral report.  
   [Circulated with the Agenda as Document A. Copy filed in the Minute Book.]

After noting that:

1. The establishment of the single market in 1985 had been a major stimulus to the creation of a number of policies and processes which would allow mobility between member states to take place. One of these was the development of a process intended to bring European states together to promote a European Higher Education Area to enhance
academic quality and the employability of graduates. The meeting in Bologna in 1999 had been the first stage in this process;

2. Initially, the emphasis had been on the need to co-ordinate higher education so that people acquired degrees of a comparable quality but further areas had been added since then and doctoral level qualifications were now included. Newcastle University had been successful in becoming the co-ordinator of the quality network looking at the shape of the future European doctorate, which was important for the University as it provided an entrée;

3. In addition, the European Union had linked the development of the European Higher Education Area with the European Research Area, which was very important for UK universities since the clear message from this link was that teaching and research should be kept together;

4. The United Kingdom (UK) realised the significance of the Bologna Process and broadly supported it, but had some concerns (for example over the proposal that masters’ programmes should be defined as lasting for two years) and would like more flexibility built in. However, it was essential that a means of reaching agreement was found if UK graduates were not to be seriously disadvantaged when it came to their mobility;

5. The Diploma Supplement was being proposed as a Europe-wide transcript which would carry the information required to facilitate transfer and employment. It was a statement of work which had been carried out on a degree programme. Some students already possessed this and so it was important that awareness was raised among University selectors. The UK had agreed that the Diploma Supplement should be implemented by 2005 and so the University needed to develop a method to do this. The aim was to achieve a combined document based around the existing transcript of study and it was hoped that Campus Management could be developed to provide the output required to produce a Diploma Supplement;

6. The UK had been slow in becoming involved in this development but was now taking a greater interest and it was important that it did participate in order to enhance the employability and mobility of graduates and continue to make the UK an attractive place to study. In the past, UK higher education had been attractive, particularly to European countries and particularly for masters’ programmes. However, the market was now much more competitive as high quality universities in Europe, such as Padua and Heidelberg, were offering programmes taught in English and with generally much lower fees. This could have serious implications for the UK;

7. There was a lack of awareness and appreciation of the issues related to the Bologna Process among University staff and even at government level. The White Paper had made no reference to it and was actually encouraging the separation of teaching and research, in total contrast to the Bologna Process recommendations. The Russell Group had been discussing how best to take this forward at government level;

8. The University had begun to formulate a strategy on the way forward on this issue and had started to raise awareness of the implications among staff, but there was still a great deal of work to be done on the operational details. A Working Group was therefore being set up to develop a comprehensive European strategy. However, the amount of money spent on this development should be monitored.
Resolved that Dr Ritchie be thanked for her helpful presentation and asked to ensure that in future Council be kept informed of any pertinent matters.

PART B: GENERAL BUSINESS

64. MINUTES

After noting that the AUT had not endorsed the proposals outlined in item 53(b), had expressed reservations and was reserving its position on this matter.

Resolved that the Minutes of the meeting held on 29 March 2004 be approved as a correct record and signed.

65. MATTERS ARISING OUT OF THE MINUTES

(a) Progress of business

Received a business tracking form.

[Circulated with the Agenda as Document B. Copy filed in the Minute Book.]

Noted that:

1. With regard to Close House, the original proposal had been to sell the property which would have then denied the University the use of the facility. However, a proposal was currently being considered under which the University would receive a considerable capital sum but also allow it to retain use of the facilities at Close House;

2. All other items on the business tracking form were either included on the agenda or in progress.

(b) Cultural Quarter

(Minute 48(b), 29.3.2004)

Considered a paper on the Great North Museum prepared by Mr J Dersley, Regional Development Officer.

[Circulated with the Agenda as Document C. Copy filed in the Minute Book.]

After noting that:

1. The proposed revised bid to the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) focussed on an extension to the current Hancock Museum together with use of an off-site store, which would allow the collections from the three museums to be displayed in the same building. Plans included the creation of a biodiversity wall and a Roman Wall display which would incorporate a new model of Hadrian’s Wall. It had not proved possible to include the renovation of the Claremont Road buildings in the revised bid, as this did not meet the terms of the HLF, but, as these buildings formed a key element in the concept of the Cultural Quarter by creating a ‘front door’ to the University, a proposal for a separate development was currently being drafted which would ensure that the two developments were closely linked;
2. The development of the Great North Museum was part of the University’s cultural strategy and there were a great many reasons why it should be supported. It would contribute to research, teaching, widening participation and the University’s reach-out to the community by greatly increasing the number of members of the public coming on to the campus. This could assist with the Cultural Quarter development as people visiting the Museum would visit the other facilities and also make people aware of the link with the University, which they were probably unaware of currently. However, in order to achieve this, there would need to be an outward visible sign that things had changed and effective marketing would be essential;

3. Submitting the bid did not commit the University to going ahead with the project as, if the HLF approved the bid, there would be six months following approval to ensure that all sources of funding were in place before a commitment was made. While some of the sources of funding were agreed, there was uncertainty about the amount that could be raised from charitable donations. However, the Development and Alumni Relations Office had been carrying out a great deal of work to try to achieve the target amount and was optimistic that it could raise a significant sum, particularly from charitable trusts which were either interested in supporting projects of this nature but would not normally support University developments, or trusts which were more likely to give greater support to this project than any other one planned by the University. The Office had also identified a list of potential individual donors and there was scope for some support from the Alumni Fund programme. However, it was important that other projects planned by the University were not adversely affected by efforts to raise support for this one development;

4. The University was committed to a major estates development programme and so it could be considered that taking on a commitment of £3m to support the Museum project was too great a risk, however supporting the project would assist with the implementation of the Estate Masterplan as it would allow the current Museum of Antiquities building to be demolished;

5. The University was obliged under its lease arrangements to be responsible for upkeep of the Hancock Museum and the costs of this would be incurred even if the Great North Museum project did not proceed;

6. It was estimated that running costs would be approximately £1.5m per annum, which was £0.5m less than the estimated cost of the previous scheme, and it was predicted that it would in time break even and perhaps even make a slight surplus. Tyne and Wear Museums Service had agreed to run the Museum, Newcastle City Council had agreed to make an annual cash contribution of £150,000 and the University would contribute an annual sum equivalent to the current operating costs of the three separate museums and the art gallery (principally the University’s core funding allocations and contribution to estates costs);

7. The two societies involved in the bid were committed to the partnership. The Society of Antiquaries had agreed to contribute £10,000 per annum for five years to assist with the establishment of a post to run the library. The Natural History Society was investigating whether it too could make a contribution;
8. The estimate for running costs included such items as planned maintenance of the building and using the off-site store but, as with all museums, did not include the major refreshing of displays. PriceWaterhouseCoopers was preparing a detailed analysis of the projected expenditure which would be looked at carefully by the HLF;

9. The project could also assist with the generation of revenue from related activities, such as other universities and summer schools for students from overseas using the facilities for field studies in the Cultural Quarter, the city and region;

10. There was a risk of cost overrun but a significant contingency fund had been included, some of which would be presented to the HLF as part of the works budget as it would definitely be spent. Executive Board would oversee the project management and would ask for the project to be subdivided to create circumscribed projects which had a clear order of implementation. In addition, the City Treasurer, the Bursar and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor had met, agreed verbally that a formal risk sharing agreement would be drawn up and a paper would be prepared which would be submitted to the new cabinet in due course;

11. The estimates included for inflation and fees had been informed by those in the professions concerned and were not considered to be excessive;

12. The project was seen as a key part of the development plans for the City and the creation of the Cultural Quarter as it formed the first stage of the redevelopment of the campus and of the development of a closer, stronger relationship between the University and the City, which was greatly welcomed;

13. Executive Board had discussed the revised proposed bid and had decided that, on balance and for a variety of reasons, the bid should be submitted.

_Resolved that:_

(i) _While Council welcomed the strengthening of the partnership, particularly with the Societies, and the improved relationship with the City, and also considered the project to have great potential, it was concerned about the issues related to funding and so, if the bid failed the project should not proceed. Council agreement was subject to the capital cash fund limits already determined and to the revenue costs discussed during the meeting;_

(ii) _Careful thought be given to how the Museum should be marketed, and in particular how it would be made obvious that a major change had taken place;_

(iii) _The Chairman of Council be given the authority to sign the bid to the Heritage Lottery Fund once it was complete;_

(iv) _The final decision whether or not to proceed with the project would be taken by Council, probably in the Spring of 2005._
(c) Joint Ethics Committee
(Minute 56, 29.3.2004)

Considered a paper from Professor P Baylis, Provost of the Faculty of Medical Sciences, recommending how the non-NHS areas which would need ethical approval should be considered in future.

[Circulated with the Agenda as Document D. Copy filed in the Minute Book.]

After noting that:

1. The new arrangements for review of research ethics had come about following the production of Governance Arrangements for Research Ethics Committees which were published in 2003 and the EU Directive 2001/20/EC which became law on 1 May 2004. Strategic Health Authorities were now responsible for research ethics committees and managed their constituencies. The University therefore was not able to nominate members to the committee;

2. There was still an issue relating to student research projects but a method for handling medical research projects had been devised. In addition, there was a national initiative to investigate whether there could be student research ethics committees;

3. There could be research which was not medically-related but required ethical approval. Under these circumstances the University would need to act as sponsor but the projects could be reviewed by local research ethics committees. There was therefore no need to establish a separate ethics committee for non-medical research, however a more effective form of research governance might be investigated.

Resolved that:

(i) The Joint Ethics Committee be disestablished with immediate effect;

(ii) The effectiveness of research governance in the University in relation to the issue of ethics for non-medical research be investigated.

66. CHAIRMAN’S BUSINESS

Code of Governance

Reported that:

(a) The Lambert Review, published in December 2003, had recommended that the Committee of University Chairmen, in consultation with the sector and government, should develop a concise code of governance representing best practice across the sector. This was currently underway, a draft code had been drawn up and the final code was due to be published in November;

(b) If recommendations outlined in the draft code were included in the final code, the University might need to review some elements of the way it operated, such as
developing written role descriptions for new members of Council, together with the capabilities required to fulfil the role. This could entail quite a considerable amount of work. However, the Russell Group had discussed the draft code and expressed concern that it might appear that the code was imposing one methodology for running a university on all institutions, which would not be appropriate, and so the University must look critically at the code;

(c) Preliminary work had begun on how best to approach these requirements and, once the final code had been published, recommendations would be brought to Council on this matter;

(d) Council had previously agreed that a performance review should take place during 2004-05. However, in the light of the possible implications for the University of the new code of practice, it might be sensible to postpone the review for a year to allow the work referred to above to take place.

Resolved that:

(i) In the light of the above, the performance review, scheduled to take place in 2004-05, be postponed until 2005-06;

(ii) Progress of the code of practice be carefully monitored by the Registrar and his staff.

67. VICE-CHANCELLOR’S BUSINESS

(a) Deaths

Received a report on deaths recently announced by the University.

[Details filed in the Minute Book.]

Resolved that Council record its deep regret and sympathy for the relatives concerned.

(b) Increasing Giving to Higher Education

Reported that:

(a) A report, Increasing Giving to Higher Education, by a government task force had been published on 13 May. The task force, chaired by Eric Thomas, Vice-Chancellor of Bristol University, had concluded that a cultural aversion to fundraising and lack of appreciation of this major source of funding was denying British universities more than £600m in extra income each year;

(b) The report stressed the importance of professional fund raising. Newcastle was already developing this area and had invested in ensuring that this was handled professionally by the Development and Alumni Relations Office;

(c) The report also recommended increased tax incentives to encourage giving and that the government should match the money invested in fundraising efforts. The government would therefore need to look critically at the tax aspect since it currently did not provide any tax advantages for those donating the money as it considered it was already generous in terms of donations;
(d) The report had been welcomed by Universities UK, which stated that it had ‘consistently emphasised the importance of varied funding streams’.

(c) Higher Education Bill

Reported that the House of Lords had supported key amendments tabled by Baroness Warwick, the Chief Executive of Universities UK, which would limit the powers of the Office of Fair Access to dictate universities’ admissions procedures. The government had now tabled an amendment which ensured that the planned access regulator would have no power to penalise universities that failed to broaden their social-class mix, as long as they could prove that they had tried to do so. This amendment would be very important for this University as it was significantly adrift from its social class benchmark, despite the success of the Partners scheme, and there had been concern that penalties would be imposed and it would not be permitted to charge fees.

(d) Guardian League Table

Reported that the Guardian University Guide 2004, published in late May, had used new methodology, much to the detriment of this University which had been ranked 57th. The Guardian had taken into account data which had never been previously included and there was some concern about some of the datasets used. This matter would therefore be brought back to Council once there had been time to carry out a clearer analysis of the issues and the possible implications for recruitment.

68. REPORT FROM SENATE

Considered a Report from the meeting of Senate held on 25 May 2004.

A. Fees Schedule 2004-05

Resolved that the Fees Schedule for 2004-05 be approved.

B. University Research Institute for Cell and Molecular Biosciences and consequential name change for the School of the same name

Noted the establishment of a University Research Institute for Cell and Molecular Biosciences.

Resolved that the School of Cell and Molecular Biosciences be re-named School of Biomedical Sciences with immediate effect.

C. Centre for Software Reliability and System Dependability

Noted.

69. REPORTS FROM STRATEGY BOARD

Considered Reports from the meeting of Strategy Board held on 25 May 2004.

[Circulated with the Agenda as Documents F1-3. Copies filed in the Minute Book.]
A. **Budget setting exercise 2004-05**

After noting that:

1. The approach to the budget setting exercise for 2004-05 had been affected by the review of the University’s resource allocation model, the changes imposed by HEFCE to the funding methodology for teaching which increased the weighting given to classroom teaching but reduced that for laboratory teaching, and the need for the institution to move towards a costing and pricing and TRAC approach in its financial management processes;

2. In addition, a new committee, the Budget Setting Group, had been established to carry out the exercise so that, for the first time, the key budget holders could be involved actively in the process in order to achieve greater clarity and understanding of the University’s position as a whole. The outcome had been a greater feeling of equity, greater involvement and a more effective process;

3. Owing to the changes in the HEFCE funding methodology, it had been necessary to carry out quite significant moderation for 2004-05 to produce a budget settlement which was manageable for the three faculties. However, the faculties had been informed that they would need to have a process in place which would allow them not to be dependent on moderation in the longer term as it was not acceptable to have the situation in which those in surplus could not benefit and invest. This was particularly important for Humanities and Social Sciences which needed to address its current staff/student ratios as these were being severely criticised;

4. It was important that the University worked together as one institution and, in the light of the changes made by HEFCE, the Faculty of Science, Agriculture and Engineering should be given time and support to develop a recovery plan which would play to its strengths. This had worked well with the Faculty of Medicine in the past;

5. It should be recognised that any resource allocation model was only an attempt to determine the right allocation and a form of moderation would generally also be required.

**Resolved that:**

(i) **The proposed budget for 2004-05 be approved;**

(ii) **A report on the progress faculties were making in drawing up plans to address the implications of the changed HEFCE funding formula be brought to the December meeting of Council.**

B. **MRI Scanner – SRIF 2 Project – Campus for Ageing and Health – General Hospital Site**

After noting that:
1. When the project to house a MRI scanner on the General Hospital site was first brought to Council it was believed that the Medical Research Council (MRC) would be responsible for the cost of the building in which it would be housed. Subsequent changes within the MRC led to it withdrawing from the project. However, as the scanner had been part of a bid to HEFCE, the University felt committed to try and continue with the project;

2. As the academic importance of this area, which was much wider than just ageing and health, was recognised and a member of staff had been employed on the assumption that this facility would be available, the University had made extensive efforts to raise the money required for the building. Just over £0.5m had been raised to date and other applications had been made;

3. The Faculty of Medical Sciences had agreed that it would accept the costs as a first charge against the Faculty budget if it failed to raise the funding externally;

4. A decision on whether or not to proceed with the project was required if the HEFCE deadline was to be met;

5. Executive Board accepted this position.

Resolved that the recommendation to proceed with the project be approved on the understanding that Executive Board keep the project under close scrutiny and monitor progress both in terms of the building work and the fund-raising activities.

C. Union Society and Union Society Trustees Funding for 2004-05

After noting that:

1. The basic proposal contained in the recommendation was for an uplift in the subvention of 5%;

2. As there was a review of the relationship between the Union Society and the University underway, it was considered that it would not be appropriate to make any major changes to the subvention at this time;

3. It had been agreed at the meeting of the Union Subvention Group that there should be no delay in reporting back the decision on funding so that the Union would be able to plan for the future.

Resolved that the recommendations for funding for 2004-05 be approved, as outlined in Section 6 of Annex A to Document F.3.

70. REPORT FROM EXECUTIVE BOARD

Considered a Report from the meeting of Executive Board held on 27 April 2004. [Circulated with the Agenda as Document G. Copy filed in the Minute Book.]

Delegated Financial Authority

After noting that:
1. The proposals in the report on Delegated Financial Authority were intended to formalise what had been rather informal arrangements in the past and clarify both the levels of authorisation of business cases and the authorisation requirements in respect of orders of substantial value which would be financed from core funds;

2. HEFCE was currently revising their code of practice on audit matters and the new code would be called the Code of Practice for Institutional Audit and Accountability. This revised code included a new emphasis on the importance of corporate governance in institutional accountability and audit, and so any financial limits approved by Council might need to be reviewed following publication of the final version. However, the University would need to bear in mind the danger of overloading Executive Board with too much, possibly minor, business;

3. While any business cases which involved the need to access reserves had to be approved by Executive Board and SAP contained a definition of the term ‘reserves’, there could be some misinterpretation of what the term ‘reserves’ meant and so it would be useful if a definition could be drafted and agreed by Council;

4. It would be useful to have the comments on Internal Audit on this proposal.

Resolved that:

(i) A definition of the term ‘reserves’ be brought back to the next meeting of Council;

(ii) Internal Audit be asked to consider the proposals and submit comments to the next meeting of Council;

(iii) Approval of the proposals concerning delegated financial authority be deferred until Council could be reassured that the University was meeting its audit requirements.

71. REPORT FROM FINANCE COMMITTEE

Received a Report from the meeting of Finance Committee held on 10 May 2004.
[Circulated with the Agenda as Document H. Copy filed in the Minute Book.]

A. Quarterly Investment Review

Noted that: Finance Committee had expressed some concern over the relationship with Baring Asset Management, the company which managed the University’s investment funds, and had decided it was necessary to address these concerns with Barings.

D. Financial Strategy

Noted that: Finance Committee had taken into consideration the University’s plans for expansion and improvement when it had made the resolution that the University should take all measures required to ensure that there was not deficit in 2004-05.

Noted the remaining items in the Report.
72. REPORT FROM AUDIT COMMITTEE

Considered a Report from the meeting of Audit Committee held on 13 May 2004.
[Circulated with the Agenda as Document J. Copy filed in the Minute Book.]

A. External Audit

Noted that: Audit Committee had approved the proposed audit strategy for 2003-04 and the fee of £41,750 plus VAT, which included an inflation increase of 2% on the fee for 2002-03.

B. Risk Management

Considered: a recommendation that Council approve the Strategic Risk Register 2004.

After noting that:

1. Audit Committee was satisfied that the University did have the correct procedures and policies for risk management in place;

2. Risk 29, the risk of severe business disruption through a major incident, was rated as green, despite the recent fire in the Old Library Building, since the fire had not caused a major disruption to business and the manner in which it had been handled had indicated that the University could cope with such a situation adequately. However, it remained on the Strategic Risk Register as it was recognised as a potential threat which was currently being managed;

3. There was an annual review of the items on the various risk registers in the University. Each school built a review of risk into its planning process and this was fed into the Faculty Risk Register. Faculty Risk Registers were then reviewed when updating the Strategic Risk Register. However, not all items on the Faculty ones featured on the Strategic Register as it was only appropriate for those which were strategic to appear at University level. The Strategic Risk Register was owned by Executive Board;

4. There was a person identified to take responsibility for each risk on the Register;

5. Despite the current optimistic forecast for the end of year position, risk 18, the failure to maintain financial viability, was listed as having changed status from green to amber as the Register had been drawn up in April when the forecast was less optimistic and it had been considered at that time that the Register should indicate there might be a problem. The issue of timing should be reviewed to prevent this apparent contradiction;

6. The change of status for risk 15, the failure to recruit, retain and reward staff of an appropriate calibre in an appropriate manner, from green to amber was due to a range of circumstances including the strike action at the time, the challenges involved in the introduction of job evaluation and the concern expressed by faculties that staff were being approached to transfer to other universities with the approach of the RAE;
7. The production and updating of the Risk Register followed PriceWaterhouseCoopers’ guidelines;

8. It might be useful for Council, at a meeting in 2004-05, to be given a presentation on how the process of risk management was managed within the University;

9. To assist with corporate governance, it would be useful if the risks were given a score level. Then, if a risk reached a certain score level, it could be scrutinised by Executive Board and, if it reached the next level, it could come to Council, which would then know it was necessary to drill down and examine the situation thoroughly. This would allow Council to be confident that it was signing off the Register in an informed manner.

Resolved that:

(i) The timing of the updating of the Strategic Risk Register and when it was presented to Council be reviewed;

(ii) Items on risk management should in future be placed higher up the order on the agenda so that they could be given due consideration;

(iii) The Chairman of Council and the Chairman of Audit Committee discuss the issues raised and bring a paper to a future meeting of Council.

C. Expenses

Noted that: Audit Committee was satisfied that all previous concerns expressed concerning the revised Expenses and Benefits Manual had been addressed and approved its implementation with effect from 1 August 2004.

D. Audit Survey 2002-03

Noted that: as the charges made for external audit by the University’s current auditors appeared to be a little high in comparison with those of other universities, and the University had not carried out a full market test for some time, Audit Committee had resolved to proceed with PriceWaterhouseCoopers as the University’s external auditors for the current year, but in the autumn review the audit and the performance of the new director. It would then decide whether or not to carry out a full market test for external audit provision.

E. Internal Audit

Noted that: as Council had previously been informed, the internal audit plan was running behind schedule and so an additional meeting of Audit Committee had been arranged for July to ensure that Internal Audit would be able to express an opinion on control in the University at the end of the current year.

73. EQUITY COMMITTEE

Considered a recommendation from Equity Committee that the constitution of the Committee be changed, as follows:
delete: A lay member of Council, appointed by Council, who shall be Chair

Two external members with relevant experience, appointed by Council

substitute: Three members with relevant experience who shall not be members of the academic staff or salaried officers of the University, one of whom shall be Chairman, appointed by Council

Resolved that the above recommendation be approved with immediate effect.

74. SAFETY COMMITTEE

Considered revised constitution and terms of reference for Safety Committee.

[Circulated with the Agenda as Document K. Copy filed in the Minute Book.]

Resolved that the revised constitution and terms of reference for Safety Committee be approved with immediate effect.

75. MINUTES OF STRATEGY BOARD

Received the Minutes of the meeting of Strategy Board held on 9 March 2004.

[Circulated with the Agenda as Document L. Copy filed in the Minute Book.]

76. REPORTED BUSINESS

Received a report of action taken in accordance with agreed procedures, approved where necessary by the Vice-Chancellor on behalf of Senate and/or the Chairman of Council on behalf of Council, and by other University bodies and Chairmen.

[Circulated with the Agenda as Document M. Copy filed in the Minute Book.]

77. DATES OF MEETINGS IN 2004-05

(Minute 49(b) & (c), 29.3.2004)

Reported that:

(a) Council would meet at 2.30 pm on the following dates in 2004-05:

11 October 2004
13 December 2004
7 February 2005
4 April 2005
23 May 2005
18 July 2005

(b) A briefing lunch for lay members would be held prior to certain of the meetings.
PART C : RESERVED BUSINESS

78. **DEPUTY VICE-CHANCELLOR UNDER STATUTE 12**

    (Minute 51, 29.3.2004)

Received a note of Senate’s discussion of this item.
    [Circulated with the Agenda as Document N. Copy filed in the Minute Book.]

Considered recommendations from the Committee on the appointment of a Deputy Vice-Chancellor under Statute 12, endorsed by Senate.

Noted that:

1. The Vice-Chancellor required time to think through the structure of the senior management team in more detail and the implications of any changes being considered;

2. Further consideration needed to be given to the purpose, process and implications of advertising externally for a Deputy Vice-Chancellor, as some Russell Group and pre-1992 universities had done recently;

3. The Committee on the appointment of a Deputy Vice-Chancellor had therefore unanimously agreed that it recommend to Senate and Council that Professor Goddard be reappointed as Deputy Vice-Chancellor for one year, from 1 August 2004 to 31 July 2005 and that the Committee continue in existence to assist with further consideration of the senior management team.

**Resolved that:**

(i) **Professor J B Goddard be re-appointed Deputy Vice-Chancellor from 1 August 2004 until 31 July 2005**;

(ii) **The Committee on the appointment of a Deputy Vice-Chancellor continue in existence.**

79. **PRO-VICE-CHANCELLOR (EXTERNAL AFFAIRS AND RESEARCH)**

Reported that:

(a) In the light of concerns expressed by Senate, the possibly misleading message which might be sent externally if the University did not have a Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research) and the need to have a senior member of the University who could represent research externally, the title of this role had been amended to ‘Pro-Vice-Chancellor (External Affairs and Research)’.

(b) The role description had been further amended to include responsibility for health and safety matters.

Received a note of Senate’s discussion of this item.
    [Circulated with the Agenda as Document N. Copy filed in the Minute Book.]
Considered a recommendation from the Committee on the appointment of Pro-Vice-Chancellors under Statute 13, endorsed by Senate, on the appointment to the role of Pro-Vice-Chancellor (External Affairs and Research).

Noted that:

1. The Chairman of Council had been present at the meeting of the Committee on the appointment of Pro-Vice-Chancellors under Statute 13 as an observer when the recommendation to appoint was agreed;

2. Although the term ‘research’ had been included in the final title of the post, this was a new role and the only responsibility for research would be its external representation. There would be no responsibility for the internal aspects of research in the University.

Resolved that Professor T F Page be appointed Pro-Vice-Chancellor (External Affairs and Research) from 1 August 2004 until 31 July 2007.

80. REPORT FROM REMUNERATION COMMITTEE

Considered a Report from the meeting of Remuneration Committee held on 6 May 2004. [Circulated with the Agenda as Document O. Copy filed in the Minute Book.]

Resolved that the recommendations in the Report be approved.

81. REPORT FROM FACULTY PROMOTIONS COMMITTEES

Reported that, in accordance with agreed procedures, the Chairman of Council, on behalf of Council, had approved the recommendations in the consolidated Report from Faculty Promotions Committees, endorsed by Senate at its meeting on 25 May 2004. [Circulated with the Agenda as Document P. Copy filed in the Minute Book.]